

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA : CRIMINAL ACTION
: NO. 12-112-01
v. :
: :
PATRICIA MCGILL : :

O R D E R

AND NOW, this **5th** day of **January, 2016**, for the reasons stated in the accompanying memorandum opinion, it is hereby **ORDERED** as follows:

1. The Government's motion to permit the jury to use a redacted indictment during deliberations (ECF No. 251) will be **TAKEN UNDER ADVISEMENT** until the conclusion of the case;
2. Defendant's motion in limine to hold a hearing to determine admissibility of alleged co-conspirators' statements and establish the order of proof to prove a conspiracy (ECF No. 356) is **DENIED**;
3. Defendant's motion in limine to bar inflammatory language (ECF No. 357) is **DENIED** as premature;
4. Defendant's motion in limine for disclosure of forged or altered documents and a bill of particulars (ECF No. 358) is **DENIED**;
5. Defendant's motion in limine to specifically disclose Brady or Giglio material (ECF No. 359) is **DENIED**;

6. Defendant's motion to exclude peer comparison data and estimate evidence (ECF No. 361) is **DENIED**;

7. Defendant's motion in limine to strike the indictment as time-barred or in the alternative to amend the indictment to conform to the statute of limitations and bar evidence outside the statute of limitations (ECF No. 367) is **DENIED**; and

8. The Court will hold a hearing on the following pretrial motions at the conclusion of jury selection in this case:

a. The Government's motion in limine to admit tape recordings and transcripts (ECF No. 306), as amended (ECF No. 371);

b. The Government's motion in limine for a determination that exhibits are business records under Federal Rule of Evidence 803(6) and that summaries of business records are admissible pursuant to Federal Rule of Evidence 1006 (ECF No. 307);

c. The Government's motion in limine to preclude assertion of a public authority defense or an entrapment by estoppel defense (ECF No. 381);

d. Defendant's motion to compel discovery (ECF No. 369); and

e. Defendant's motion to dismiss Counts 2-14 of the Indictment as violative of due process rights under the void for vagueness doctrine, or in the alternative a motion in limine to properly define the hospice regulation to the jury (ECF No. 380) .

AND IT IS SO ORDERED.

/s/ Eduardo C. Robreno
EDUARDO C. ROBRENO, J.